



---

# PLANNING COMMISSION

Department of Urban Planning & Design P. O. Box 27210 Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210

---

Approved by Planning Commission  
on November 7, 2007 as submitted.

Date of Meeting: October 3, 2007

The meeting of the City of Tucson Planning Commission was called to order by Daniel J. Williams, Chair, on Wednesday, October 3, 2007, at 7:00 p.m. in the Mayor and Council Chambers, City Hall, 255 W. Alameda Street, Tucson, Arizona. Those present and absent were:

## 1. ROLL CALL

### Commission Members Present:

Daniel J. Williams, Chair  
Grace Evans  
Sami Hamed  
Brad Holland

Shannon McBride-Olson  
Robert Patrick  
Daniel R. Patterson  
Craig Wissler

### Commission Members Absent:

Katie Bolger  
James Watson  
Catherine Applegate Rex, Vice-chair

### Staff Members Present:

Michael McCrory, Principal Assistant City Attorney  
Viola Romero, Attorney's Office  
Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design, Director  
Joanne Hershenhorn, Urban Planning and Design, Lead Planner  
Roger Howlett, Urban Planning and Design, Principal Planner  
Aline Torres, Urban Planning and Design, Lead Planner  
Adam Smith, Urban Planning and Design, Principal Planner  
Jim Mazzocco, Urban Planning and Design, Planning Administrator  
Norma Stevens, Urban Planning and Design, Secretary  
Ceci Sotomayor, City Clerk's Office, Recording Secretary  
Yolanda Lozano, City Clerk's Office, Recording Secretary in Training

**2. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL: August 22, 2007**

**MOTION** by Commissioner Patterson, duly seconded, to approve the minutes of August 22, 2007, with corrections. Motion passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0 (Commissioners Bolger, Watson and Vice Chair Rex were absent).

**3. PCD (PLANNED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT) TEXT AMENDMENT (FINAL RECOMMENDATION)**

Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design, Director, spoke stating there was not a presentation per say, but information/comments in the Commission's packets as requested, a clean copy of the ordinance. Also a copy of a red-lined version was provided to the Commission. He shared that several comments had been directed to staff regarding changes that occurred from September 19<sup>th</sup> to the version before the Commission. There was some desire to, perhaps, seek additional comments from people interested in commenting on the changes, then his recommendation to the Commission was to re-open the Public Hearing to allow people to speak.

Chair Williams asked what the Commission's pleasure was as far as re-opening the Public Hearing to allow for input on the changes.

Commissioner Patrick stated if no changes were made that were not changes specifically directed by the Commission, he did not feel the public hearing should be re-opened. However, there may be changes that the staff made and asked what changes were not made by the Commission.

Mr. Elias stated that the red-lined version, for the most part, was for clarification. The only thing being more substantive was the provision on page 3, under subsection C, where it talks about how a PCD and specific provisions in the PCD would be in place and would supersede what was in the code unless there were some things that were not addressed in the PCD. The purpose of this was to try and make it clearer, that the PCD will govern. The changes on page 7, regarding the three-hundred feet, was something the Commission talked about. There were other eliminations in the definitions and explanations about the major, minor and administrative change processes. Those are the big ones.

Michael McCrory, Principal Assistant City Attorney, stated staff has tried, particularly with the amendment process, where significant concerns were voiced, that a process was brought forward when presented in a red-line version, was difficult to follow. There are substantial questions for the Commission to determine on how we are treating the administrative process in terms of whether it was discretionary on the part of the City, what was in those categories, or was it something where the categories are absolute and the City has no ability to say that something has or does not have an impact. The staff has tried to address what they thought the Commission wanted those to be, but this was something that could be discussed at a future hearing.

Commissioner Patrick stated staff was working with different stake holders in preparation of this document. He hated to see staff go through all the work in preparing this document and then have it, at the last minute, changed and make people unhappy. He felt it might be better if the changes were addressed to the stake holders in the next couple of weeks and could be heard again at the next hearing. If no resolution, then maybe the public hearing should be re-opened. He also stated he did not like re-opening public hearings once the Commission has closed them. But if we were essentially adopting something of substance, or recommending something of substance, that was contrary or different then what was worked out originally, whether it be home owners associations, builders or other jurisdictions, he did not like doing something at the last minute that was contrary to what has been worked on.

Commissioner Evans stated if what Commissioner Patrick said was a motion, she would second it.

Commissioner Patrick then stated he was making it a motion.

Chair Williams asked if Commissioner Patrick was making a motion to re-open the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Patrick stated no, he wanted to continue this item to the next meeting without going through a lot of discussion, just simply continue it to the next meeting to allow the staff and stake holders they worked with to determine if there was a problem with this. He felt there was no real hurry to get this item to Mayor and Council. If there are potential problems that can be worked out between staff and stake holders, it would be better to handle it this way than to try and re-invent the wheel at a public hearing.

Commissioner Evans stated she had a procedural question in that she thought the public hearing had to be re-opened because it was originally closed.

**MOTION** made by Commissioner Patrick, duly seconded, to re-open the Public Hearing and continue it to the next meeting on November 7, 2007. Motion passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0 (Commissioners Bolger, Watson and Vice Chair Rex were absent).

Commissioner Patrick asked if by doing this, would it cause any problems along the way. This was the implementing document for the biggest area plan we have ever adopted and wants to make sure it was right.

Mr. Elias stated no more than the usual. No procedural issues, staff can advertise for the November 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, have the public hearing and allow whoever wanted to speak, speak.

Chair Williams asked if we would be getting into a time issue regarding this plan.

Mr. Elias commented 45 days from the time the hearing was closed on September 19<sup>th</sup>, would expire around November 3<sup>rd</sup>. Because we could not schedule a Public Hearing for

Mayor and Council between November 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>, when the meeting is held and dealt with at the November 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, we would be fine.

Chair Williams stated there was sufficient time to continue the public hearing until November. He had a question about in the plan. On page 1, specific plans are referred to. Before, it was area plans, now it states specific plans. What was meant by a specific plan?

Mr. Elias commented it was a more generic term that refers to all the additional plans such as sub-regional plans, area plans, neighborhood plans. Instead of saying that over and over, staff has used this generic term of specific plans. He also pointed out, zoning specific plans, capital S, capital P; those are discreet zoning plans for specific locations. In this case we are using lower case s and lower case p which means the more general term Mr. McCrory referred to.

Mr. McCrory commented the actual term used by the *Land Use Code* to describe all the plans that implement the general plan was specific plan. That incorporates all of those. If you list area and neighborhood you are not intentionally excluding sub-regional. So by using the one term, it includes everything.

Chair Williams stated he had a couple more questions: 1) on page 6, (B) where it refers to a master water and sewer plan that a capacity analysis was performed. This was not necessarily part of a water and sewer plan and this was requested to be added as well and should be inserted in some type of language as well and 2) on page 12, 2.6.4.6 should be 2.6.4.8.

Mr. McCrory replied on the question regarding page 6 – the change was including item b, Master Water and Sewer System, right above it item iv – existing and proposed rates of on-site and off-site flows. That was to extend it beyond the off site. Previously this was struck, but added back in.

Chair Williams asked on pg 4, (B) (1) (a) (ii), it states “An explanation of the application describing how the PCD district complies with the policies of applicable *General Plan*, specific, area or neighborhood plan,” - what about adding the purpose as well?

Mr. Elias asked for clarification – in the Master Development Plan section, which includes the Land Use Plan, Infrastructure Plan, etc.; the Land Use Plan shall contain an explanation of how the PCD complies with the policies in the applicable plan. Do you want to say purpose in policies? Are you referring to the underlying plan?

Chair Williams stated that was correct, the PCD purpose. We have a purpose statement in the PCD under 2.6.4.1.

Mr. Elias then stated that reference was not being made to the underlying plan, but to the purpose of the PCD.

Commissioner Patrick stated on page 6, top of the page under the drainage and hydrology plan, he believed item iv was inserted to accommodate his concerns. This was not specific or broad enough. This was essential to what we are currently doing for on-site and off-site flows. We are not considering the cumulative effect for up stream and down stream of the detention/retention structures we are building. This language would accommodate a direction for an existing hydrology study which does not do that. He wanted to add language something to the effect of considering the effect of up stream and down stream detention and retention facilities.

Chair Williams asked if it was the intent of this to have regional retention/detention basins because it does not go into discussion on it and leads him to believe we can continue the way things are in now within the City that we can have mini basins everywhere that gets to be a headache of everyone. In a master plan development as this, we need to have regional basins.

Mr. Elias stated this was certainly policy direction in the Houghton Area Master Plan to have a regional watershed basin approach to detention/retention as opposed to lot by lot basis. This would be one of the things staff would be looking for in the application. It was possible, that we might not have this policy direction at another specific location. It was a broader policy direction that would probably be established at the plan policy level as opposed to the zoning level.

Chair Williams stated if it was in the master development plan, it leads the development community to believe that was what we would be looking for. Without that in there, there was no direction.

Commissioner Patrick commented he thought the issue centers around ownership of those facilities and what happened was we passed flood control ordinances mandating retention/detention in critical basins where the flow quantity exceeded what should be 100 year flood levels. However, both City and the County determined they were not going to own those facilities, as a result all the retention/detention facilities with a few major exceptions, like a couple on the Julian Wash one by Houghton and one by the Juvenile Detention Center. All the rest are privately owned. If we are going to have detention/retention, it was efficiently, effectively managed as a public effort and Mayor and Council would determine it was a public deal and should be under public ownership.

Chair Williams stated that included in the Houghton Area Master Plan was language to support regional basins and that they are maintained by the City. Was this the direction the City wanted to go? As it is, the neighborhood communities are not able to maintain these because they do not even know it was required to maintain them. Was this the direction the City wanted to take in getting them in to their system and set up a funding mechanism such as the homeowners association pays a "X" amount of dollars per unit into the fund to maintain them? This seems like a good way to assure these are continually maintained.

Mr. Elias stated he agreed, but this was a policy decision on the part of Mayor and Council and certainly there will be opportunities to have regional size basins. The decision would need to be made project by project.

Commissioner Patrick stated it was actually the flood control district when talking about regional facilities.

Commissioner Evans asked for points of clarification. She stated that a definition of specific plans needed to be stated in the definitions section. For old-timers such as her, remember very clearly that specific plan was a term of art and believes it was gone now from the *Land Use Code*, was this correct?

Mr. McCrory responded the term was defined in the *Land Use Code*, but it applies to planning and used the same way as in State Law. A specific plan was a plan that carries it out. The old term “specific plan” was replaced with “planned area development” and has been renamed as such. The old specific plan referred to a specific zoning plan and was not used anymore.

Commissioner Evans stated on page 7, 2.6.4.6, (A) (1), second sentence needs to be a bit clearer. Page 9, under minor amendment, she asked if a minor amendment needed public hearing review. She asked if public hearing review was a term of art, a procedural term of art or was it just a public hearing.

Mr. Elias stated it was a public hearing review held by the zoning examiner.

Chair Williams stated on page 9, 10 (D) (2) Multiple minor amendments – there was to be some clarification as to when multiple minor amendments constitute a major amendment.

#### **4. GRANT-ALVERNON AREA PLAN AMENDMENT (PA-07-05) (PUBLIC HEARING)**

Joanne Hershenhorn, Urban Planning and Development, Lead Planner, made a presentation. She stated in the staff report, under Issue, it made reference to a rezoning request to O3. This was an error as discussed last month. The developers are not sure what office zoning they will be requesting. She also updated the Commissioners under Public Contact that three letters of support had been received after the staff report had been completed. The request from Michael Grassinger of the Planning Center on behalf of the property owner, Abraham Slilaty, was to amend the land use plan and change the land use designation from residential to high density residential and office, basically to allow construction of an office complex as discussed in study session last month.

Ms. Hershenhorn reviewed with the Commission, the location map, zoning and land use map, conceptual land use map which showed the existing and proposed uses, the plan amendment site, and aerial photo from 2005.

Ms. Hershenhorn stated staff believed the proposal was consistent with plan policies in both the Grant Alvernon Area Plan and the general plan. Staff also believes the proposed office use can be designed compatibility with the adjacent residential uses. Access would be from Fort Lowell only. The Grant Alvernon Area Plan policies support development of vacant property. Key issues staff considered were compatibility with residential uses, stabilizing/improving neighborhood edge, and traffic. Traffic was the one issue neighbors in the area expressed concern about in the past when an amendment proposal was brought forward. It appears most of the concerns are related to the ambient traffic levels which have increased in the past six to seven years. Office uses would definitely generate less traffic than commercial uses and less traffic than high density residential uses. Staff would like to suggest that the Commission recommend to Mayor and Council to amend the conceptual land use map to allow office and high-density residential uses on the amendment site because it would provide a good transition use between the residential uses to the east and commercial and office uses to the west. Amending this recognizes that there was increasing development pressure in the area. Office use can be designed to be compatible with adjacent residential uses and improve visual character of the area.

Mike Grassinger gave a brief presentation to the Commission reiterating Ms. Hershenhorn's presentation. He stated, regarding the traffic, they are currently working with the adjoining property owner. Currently, Fort Lowell does not have a center turning lane. Because it will be included because of the Davidson school rezoning to the end of their property, they are working with property owners in between there so that it can be extended to the length of their property.

Commissioner Patrick stated the Commission received a letter from Jack Swiergol. He asked if Mr. Swiergol owned the trailer park to the west of the property in question.

Mr. Grassinger stated he did not. Mr. Swiergol owns the commercial office building to the west.

Chair Williams asked Mr. Grassinger for clarification on his plan. It shows offices being built, but requesting high density residential and office. Why the difference in what was being requested vs. what was being proposed.

Mr. Grassinger stated the reason for this designation was because there were no others to ask for. If there was strictly an office designation, that was what they would have requested.

Mr. Elias stated on Attachment F-1 of the *Grant Alvernon Area Plan, Conceptual Land Use Map, Existing*, it shows the nine categories that are available for that area. Mr. Grassinger was correct in his request and was seeking office, commercial, high-density residential zoning.

Commissioner McBride-Olson commented about the traffic in the area, particularly east on Fort Lowell, when you need to make a turn was pretty dangerous. Her hope was to have the traffic mitigated in the area with a turn lane into the complex.

Commissioner Holland stated he was on the committee that put together the Grant-Alvernon Area Plan (*GAAP*). They were interested in how the structures of the buildings looked as well as what was in them. They wanted to give people as much latitude and permission to be able to co-use the properties for residential and business. A comment in looking at the plans from Mr. Grassinger, there was a one story building facing Fort Lowell and behind some two-story buildings sort of set back. The reason behind the rule for the high-density residential office was to allow higher profile buildings along the arterial streets. In the two years spent working on the *GAAP*, there was much interest in getting as high profile as possible along the arterial streets in order to block the noise. One of the issues that had come up, with the extensions to Fort Lowell and improvements to Alvernon, has been an increase in traffic which contributes to an increase in noise. He told Mr. Grassinger that he did not believe he would have a problem in substance if he proposed something with a higher profile.

Mr. Grassinger stated he would take back the comments to his clients. He felt this was not what would actually be built. They had an architect work on the project, to put something together that demonstrated the worse-case scenario, the maximum amount of office building space for the property. They are looking at smaller buildings spread further apart.

Commissioner Holland stated this area, more so than others, was not interested in making it pretty or territorial. There was so much eclectic going on in this neighborhood.

Commissioner McBride-Olson stated it was comforting to her to see they are considering doing one-story buildings next to the existing residential. A two-story building next to them would drop a pretty big shadow on them.

Mr. Grassinger agreed and stated in their meetings, representatives from Barrio Centro were present and they committed to them that they would definitely be single story buildings next to them.

At this point, Chair Williams opened the Public Hearing.

Michael Toney stated there were some interesting comments made. He felt the high density was problematic. He also spoke regarding the makeup of the area, green space, habitat, and adobe style buildings, quality of life.

Tricia Amado, resident of Barrio Centro, spoke as she was not able to attend the neighborhood meeting. She was in favor of the plan specifically because she does not want to see some sort of commercial enterprise or apartment complex. She was mostly concerned with traffic in the area. From her standpoint and some of her neighbor's, they like this type of use for the property. It would also be nice if, in their design plan, they included more desert adapted landscaping to encourage whatever wildlife was there.



**MOTION** made by Commissioner Evans, duly seconded, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed by voice vote of 8 to 0 (Commissioners Bolger, Watson and Vice Chair Rex were absent)

**MOTION** made by Commissioner Evans, duly seconded, to forward this item with a recommendation to Mayor and Council for approval passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0 (Commissioners Bolger, Watson and Vice Chair Rex were absent)

Discussion followed.

Commissioner Evans stated she wanted to suggest to the applicant about the transition to the south. They too deserve some transition in terms of single story buildings as well. The plan policies guideline talks about transitioning and having sensitive land uses.

Chair Williams stated it seemed to him that this was a win-win situation in which the neighborhood supports the plan and the development community has been working with them to make sure that they have something compatible.

Commissioner Evans stated it appears there was support among the neighboring residents for a lower-intensity office given that there was an increasing amount of traffic on Fort Lowell. This project was certainly large enough to be designed compatible with existing and adjoining land uses, including the mobile home areas to the west and south.

Commissioner Patrick complimented the developer and Mr. Grassinger for working with the neighborhood in bringing this plan forward which helps make things much easier.

**5. ARTISAN RESIDENCE LUC AMENDMENT (STUDY SESSION) AND ARTISAN RESIDENCE LUC AMENDMENT (PUBLIC HEARING)**

Albert Elias, Urban, Planning and Design, Director, stated the presentation would be made by Aline Torres, Urban Planning and Design, Lead Planner, but he wanted to point out this item was scheduled for a study session per the Commission's direction. Staff took the liberty to create an option for the Commission to hold a public hearing to allow the text amendment to proceed to Mayor and Council in November. The procedure was to utilize the Study Session for further discussion amongst the Commission regarding the amendment. If the Commission desired, they could set this item for Public Hearing, Open and Close and make recommendation to Mayor and Council.

**MOTION** by Commissioner Patrick, duly seconded, to conclude the Study Session and hold the Public Hearing. Motion passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0 (Commissioners Bolger, Watson and Vice Chair Rex were absent).

Chair Williams asked staff to make their presentation.

Ms. Torres stated at the last meeting, Commissioner Evans asked staff to expand what was being worked on as far as Artisan in Residence uses to a live/work situation. In the

background information stated in the memo, it will allow artists to continue to do what they do now, but provide additional criteria for reviewers at the permitting phase to be able to point to and recognize this was an allowed use and allow it to go forward.

Chair Williams asked if this was currently allowed in Neighborhood Commercial (*NC*) zoning?

Ms. Torres stated she felt by adding it to *NC* and including craftwork as part of the allowed use, this would be allowed.

Chair Williams announced the Public Hearing was open.

David Aguirre stated in his experience as an artist, he thought he knew all the artists in town. Recently an exhibit was held, back in May, where over 500 artists were listed and rejected from the Tucson Museum of Art Exhibit. He rents out the ADOT warehouses on 6<sup>th</sup> street and was running out of space. Many more artists are coming and there was a need for live/work space.

Robert Redding spoke that he too was an artist and real estate broker. He has many clients or agents that come to him stating they have a need for live/work space. His reply to them was that there are only two things on the books; live in the downtown warehouse arts district or El Presidio Neighborhood. They will need to spend a lot of money in order to have a space that you can actually do your art work in and live in. Many are not down and out starving artists, they do own homes and have other jobs, but look forward to having an alternative to selling their home and moving into an artist in residence. He has worked with a few developers that are looking forward to have this item go through.

Dwight Metzcar was an artist working downtown. He supports this initiative to have artisan in residence zoning and revitalizing the arts district.

**MOTION** by Commissioner Hamed, duly seconded to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed by voice vote of 8 to 0 (Commissioners Bolger, Watson and Vice-Chair Rex were absent).

**MOTION** by Commissioner Patrick, duly seconded, to forward to Mayor and Council with recommendations as presented by staff. Motion passed by voice vote of 8 to 0 (Commissioners Bolger, Watson and Vice-Chair Rex were absent).

Discussion followed.

Commissioner Holland stated he was most pleased to see *NC* included and hoped artists would move towards mid-town.

Commissioner McBride-Olson commented she too was an artist. While living in Washington D.C., she was fortunate enough to have a studio in a place called the Torpedo Factory – a wonder place which allowed artists to rent at a very cheap rate

studio and gallery space. In the absence of having a place such as this, she felt this was a really good thing to promote in Tucson.

Chair Williams stated this was a good thing to increase the ability of artists to live and work in the same area, to have a viable business in their living environment and he supports this.

Commissioner Patrick asked a question of staff. He wanted to know if staff was going to continue pursuing broadening the base of this in some efforts upcoming with some other ordinance changes. Was this recommendation going to eliminate or slow down that process?

Mr. Elias stated if the Commission wanted to comment about staff pursuing a subsequent text ordinance that would broaden live/work opportunities for other situations beyond just artists, they might want to include that as a comment or suggestion and staff could relay that information to Mayor and Council.

Commissioner Patrick asked staff to include something to that effect in the letter to Mayor and Council.

**6. RESIDENTIAL CLUSTER PROJECT LUC AMENDMENT (RENAMED TO FLEXIBLE LOT DEVELOPMENT) (STUDY SESSION)**

Adam Smith, Urban Planning and Design, Principal Planner, gave a presentation. The *Flexible Lot Development (FLD)* was merely one prong in a three prong infill strategy approach.

- University of Arizona Environs Pilot Overlay
- Flexible Lot Development
- Mixed Use Infill Zone

He reviewed what *Flexible Lot Development* was. The ordinance was comprised of four basic sections: purpose, applicability, development criteria and review and approval. Under the development criteria section, functional open space requirement, transition edge treatment, landscaping, parking, minimum lot size and lot coverage, and architectural design were discussed. Mr. Smith also reviewed the review and approval process of; five acres or less review process, more than five acres review process, architectural design plan review process and design hearing office process.

Discussion followed regarding the following topics:

- Language in text amendment for areas less than five acres
- Language in text amendment under density matrix needs to be clearer.
- Who, besides staff, had input or looked at documents in terms of applicability?
- General Development Criteria

- Lot size reduction
- Mitigation
- One-Story vs Two Story buildings
- Neighborhood Parks (neighborhood association maintained or dedicated to the City of Tucson)
- Configuration and Location of Open Space within an FLD Project, 5 acres or less
- Common open space
- Five foot wall when *FLD* was of a more intense use next to a less intense
- Modifications and process, current RCP requires air circulation, light, solar access (process similar to architectural design plan)
- Work on language in reference to neighborhood and area plan (specific plan), provide specific criteria.
- Design Hearing Officer should have two appointments recommended by City Manager and appointed by Mayor and Council.
- Maximum density option, how many requests per year

**MOTION** made by Commissioner Patrick, duly seconded to continue the Study Session. Motion passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0 (Commissioners Bolger, Watson and Vice-Chair Rex were absent).

Discussion followed on the following topics:

- Alternative residential development, modifications of energy efficiency requirement, what does this mean? (Green Building)
- Common open space requirements – gyms, tennis, courts – why was this counted as functional open space?
- Landscaping, Screening and Wall Requirements

Mr. Elias asked, with the Commission's approval to continue the Study Session and also advertise for a public hearing

## **7. KINO AREA PLAN AMENDMENT (PA-07-06) (STUDY SESSION)**

Joanne Hershenhorn, Urban Planning and Design, Lead Planner made a presentation to the Commission. The applicant was Bob Conant on behalf of the property owners, Garold C. Brown Family Limited Partnership, who are requesting to amend the Land Use Plan to allow commercial uses in an area designated for residential, medium to high density. The following items were reviewed:

- Location Map
- Zoning and Land Use Map
- Plan Amendment Site
- Plan Policies
- Issues
- Recommendation, set for public hearing at the November meeting.

Ms. Hershenhorn stated the applicant was proposing six acres of self-storage units on this site. General Plan has standard policies about compatibility and protecting nearby residential uses and supports commercial developments at major streets. There are lots of schools in the area and safety of school children was of paramount importance.

Bob Conant, The Planning Center, stated a neighborhood meeting was held and only one resident showed up. The school district was contacted, as well as Councilman Leal's office, and neither of them had any objections.

Topics of discussion were:

- Type of fencing around property
- Additional neighborhood meetings, letters of support
- Contact all school principals in the area, not just the district office
- 24-7 staffing and security for area, especially near schools
- Tucson Police Department's input

**MOTION** by Commissioner Patrick, duly seconded, to set this item for Public Hearing at the November 7, 2007 meeting.

Upon roll call, the results were:

Aye: Commissioners Evans, Hamed, Holland, McBride-Olson,  
Patrick, Wissler, and Chair Williams

Nay: Commissioner Patterson

Absent: Commissioners Bolger, Watson and Vice Chair Rex

Motion carried by a roll call vote of 7 to 1 to set item for Public Hearing.

## **8. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **a. Mayor and Council Update:**

Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design Director, stated the Council was tentatively scheduled to discuss the University of Arizona Environs Overlay on October 23, 2007.

Commissioner Patrick asked about the Neighborhood Protection Ordinance.

Mr. Elias stated the ordinance did go to Mayor and Council and staff was asked to change the scope of the approach. They were given about seventy-five days to work on this and present additional information on how to execute preservation overlay in the residential areas and arterial street corridors.

**b. Infill Ordinance Update:**

Commissioner Holland asked if it was possible to get the Infill Sub-Committee to address lot-split policy and lot-split process, particularly with regards to the lot-split exception.

**c. Other Planning Commission Items (Future agenda items for discussion/assignments)**

None were discussed.

**9. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

Michael Toney spoke commenting on the remnants of the wash which was slowly eroding in the area by Campbell and Drexel, the lack of interest by City Council to restore torn vegetation in developments, and overlay zones.

**10. ADJOURNMENT: 10:52 p.m.**